



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,597	09/18/2000	John Carl Brown	Brown 2000-0315	4748
7590 03/16/2004			EXAMINER	
Henry T Brendzel PO BOX 574 Springfield, NJ 07081			NGUYEN, HANH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2662	2
DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/664,597

Applicant(s)

BROWN ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-17 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2662

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 8, 14 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 5, how the mapping functions P and Q are algorithmically determined ?

In claim 8, line 2, “an identifier that is instrumental in routing said packet” is vague.

In claim 14, “said element is said second network” is vague.

In claim 21, is “functions P” referred to “said encryption function P” on line 9

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-10 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by **Mahalingaiah et al.** (US pat. No. 6,654,346 B1).

In claims 1, 5, 8 and 21, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses an entry module 16a in a subnetwork 12a (a node in a first network) receives a packet from terminal 14a (a packet source), wraps the packet (encryption) and transmits the wrapped packet to terminal 14b via an exit module 16b in a subnetwork 12b (a node in a second network). See col.10 line 55 to col.11, line 30. In Fig.4, the exit module 16b (the node in the second network) receives the wrapped packet from the entry module 16a, performs mapping by reading bit fields (at least a subfield) in the header (an address field) of the received wrapped packet. See col.15, lines 10-45 & col.16, lines 25-45. A traffic controller 38 (an element) in entry and exit modules 16a, 16b (elements in the first and second networks) controls the mapping above respectively by comparing destination address within the wrapped packet (X address) corresponding to a terminal 14b (Y address). See col.16, line 65 to col.17, line10 & col.15, lines 35-40. The wrapped packet is embeded by the entry module 16a with a security code (see fig.9) (encrypting the packet), and transmitted to the exit module 16b which removes the wrap information to yield only the embeded packet (decrypting corresponding to the encrypting). See col.17, line 65 to col.18, line 15.

In claims 6 and 7, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses, in Fig.14, the exit module 116 (node in a second network) storing a mapping table 118 (storing a mapping table) which comprises incoming users addresses and securrity codes respectively. See col.20, lines 55-67. The mapping table 118 removes wrapped information to yield only embeded packet (developing decryption function) which is fowarded to terminal device 14b. See col.18, lines 5-15.

In claim 9, the limitation has been addressed in claim 1 (see Fig.6).

In claim 13, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses, in Fig.1, subnet 12 are interconnected via links (nodes connecting via links).

In claims 14, 15 and 16, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses the traffic controller 38 (call agent) in modules 16a, 16b respectively controls routing packets (see col.11, lines 50-55), mapping packets. See col.16, lines 16, lines 65-67 .

In claim 19, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses the subnets 12a and 12b are parts of Internet 10 (first network and second network carry information in packet format). See col.10, lines 55-60.

In claims 10, 17 and 20, **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses, in fig.2, exit module 16b in subnet 12b receiving packet from subnet 12a via other subnet 12 (a third network) (node in second network receives packets from first network via one or more other networks). See col.11, lines 35-45.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mahalingaiah et al.** (US pat. No. 6,654,346 B1).

In claims 11 and 12, **Mahalingaiah et al.** does not disclose elements outside second network linked to a PSTN or media terminal adapter. Since **Mahalingaiah et al.** discloses, in Fig.1, a plurality of subnets 12a 12b can be interconnected to external subnet 12. Therefore, a PSTN or a media terminal adapter would have been obvious as the external subnet to one ordinary skill in the art connecting the first network and a second network See col.10, lines 55-65. The motivation is to expand subnetworks into a backbone.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In claim 2, the prior art does not disclose functions P and Q change upon occurrence of an event.

In claim 18, the prior art does not disclose if said step of determining concludes that said result of said mapping does not correspond to a valid packet destination in said second network, mapping said at least a sub-field of an address field contained in packets received from said first network with a function **P'**, which corresponds to the mapping function employed by said node prior to the last change in mapping function **P**.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2662

Redlich (US Pat. No. 6,591,306 B1) discloses IP Network Access for Portable Devices.

Friedman et al. (US pat. No. 6,151,679) discloses System and Method for Preventing a First Node From Being Emulated by Another Node.

Ankney et al. (US Pat. No. 5,113,499) discloses Telecommunication Access Management System for a Packet Switching Network.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 703 306-5445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 703 306-4744. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9314 for regular communications and 703 308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305-4700.

Fax number: (703) 872-9314

Hanh Nguyen


March 8, 2004